

## REMARKS

The new claims are supported by the original specification as filed. Claims 87 and 88 are patterned after claim 60, and are supported by page 1, lines 5-8; page 2 lines 9-12; page 5, lines 12-13; page 16, lines 18-20; and page 28, lines 10-22. Claims 88-90 are patterned after claim 36. No new matter is involved in these amendments.

In the outstanding Office Action, numerous claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and second paragraph. While Applicant does not acquiesce in those rejections, the rejected claims have been cancelled, making the rejections moot.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 32 and 33 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims of the following three U.S. patents to Applicant: 6,437,464; 6,617,721 and 6,501,616. While these rejections are traversed, the claims have been cancelled as well, making the rejections moot.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 32-45, 62-76 and 81-85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,650,896 (Viskochil) in view of the Injection Molding Handbook (Rosato). While this rejection is traversed, these claims have been cancelled as well, making the rejection moot.

The Examiner indicated that claims 60 and 61 were allowable. It is also believed that new claims 86 and 87, and claims 88-90 dependent thereon, are allowable.

Since each of the rejections has been overcome, an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven P. Shurtz/  
Steven P. Shurtz  
Registration No. 31,424  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
Direct: (801) 444-3933